

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

<b>ALEXANDER OTIS MATTHEWS,</b>	:	<b>Civil No. 1:18-cv-0077</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>WARDEN FCI ALLENWOOD,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendant.</b>	:	<b>Judge Sylvia H. Rambo</b>

**ORDER**

Before the court is a report and recommendation of the magistrate judge (Doc.17) in which he recommends that Petitioner Alexander Matthew's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. 1) be denied. No objections have been filed.

In the petition, Matthews, a federal inmate confined at LSCI Allenwood in Allenwood, Pennsylvania, challenges the prison's disciplinary process generally on due process grounds and asserts that sanctions imposed on him by the prison were improper because there was insufficient evidence to support a finding of misconduct on his part. After a close examination of the record, the magistrate judge found that Matthews was afforded full procedural protections and that there was sufficient evidence to support the prison's finding of misconduct.

In considering whether to adopt a report and recommendation when no objections have been filed, the court should, as a matter of good practice, "satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the

recommendation.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see also Univac Dental Co. v. Dentsply Intern., Inc.*, 702 F. Supp. 2d 465, 469 (M.D. Pa. 2010) (explaining that judges should review dispositive legal issues raised by the report for clear error). Following an independent review of the record, the court is satisfied that the report and recommendation contains no clear error, and will therefore adopt the recommendation and deny the petition for habeas corpus. Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** as follows:

1. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 17) is **ADOPTED**.
2. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. 1) is **DENIED**.
3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.
4. A certificate of appealability shall not issue as Petitioner has failed to demonstrate a “substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

s/Sylvia H. Rambo  
SYLVIA H. RAMBO  
United States District Judge

Dated: June 11, 2019